DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 381 815 CS 508 870

AUTHOR Lieberman, Devorah A.; Gurtov, Ellene
TITLE Perceptions of Diversity Training Needs in High Tech Business.
PUB DATE Nov 94
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (80th, New Orleans, LA, November 19-22, 1994).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; *Corporate Education; *Cultural Differences; *Cultural Pluralism; Diversity (Institutional); Industry; *Inplant Programs; *Organizational Climate; *Organizational Communication; Professional Training
IDENTIFIERS Pacific Northwest

ABSTRACT

A study questioned 12 human resource personnel, corporation managers, and diversity trainers about their perceptions of diversity training needs in Pacific Northwest high tech organizations. The overarching research questions for the study were as follows: (1) What are the most frequently reported diversity training needs among human resource personnel and company managers currently working in Pacific Northwest high tech corporations? (2) What are the diversity training needs in high tech corporations reported by professional diversity trainers? All responses were analyzed using an analytical inductive approach. Emergent themes were identified and categorized. Results indicated that all participants expressed a need for common understanding of the concept "diversity" and "diversity training." Also, most participants felt a need to develop more extensive cultural diversity programs, though human resource personnel and managers expressed the need to obtain upper management support if diversity training was to become company policy. Finally, trainers voiced the belief that organizations look for more "quick-fix" approaches to diversity training rather than long term changes in organizational culture. These results are not necessarily generalizable. A study gathering data from a wider and more inclusive sample from other than Pacific Northwest high tech companies is in order. Also, findings from other studies comparing perceptions of other employees (e.g., top executives, line staff) could provide diversity trainers and high tech corporations with more complete information about employee needs and diversity trainer assessment of their clients' needs. (Contains 25 references and 4 tables of data.) (TB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 381 815

PERCEPTIONS OF DIVERSITY TRAINING NEEDS

IN

HIGH TECH BUSINESS

Devorah A. Lieberman
Associate Professor
Department of Speech Communication
Portland State University
Box 751
Portland, OR 97207
(503) 7253534

Ellene Gurtov
Instructor
Department of Speech Communication
Portland State University
Box 751
Portland, OR 97207

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Lieberman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Devorah Lieberman, who is at the Department of Speech Communication, Portland State University, Box 751, Portland, Oregon, 97207.

Running Head: Perceptions of Diversity

CS508870

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Perceptions of Diversity Training Needs in High Tech Business

Twelve human resource personnel, corporation managers and diversity trainers reported their perceptions of diversity training needs in Pacific Northwest high tech organizations. The overarching research questions for this study were: 1) What are the most frequently reported diversity training needs among human resource personnel and company managers currently working in Pacific Northwest high tech corporations? and, 2) What are the diversity training needs in high tech corporations reported by professional diversity trainers? All responses were analyzed using an analytic inductive approach. Emergent themes were identified and categorized. Results indicate that all participants expressed a need for common understanding of the concept "diversity" and "diversity training." Also, most participants felt a need to develop more extensive cultural diversity programs, though human resource personnel and managers expressed the need to obtain upper management support if diversity training is to become company policy. Finally, trainers voiced the belief that organizations look more for "quick-fix" approaches to diversity training than long term changes in organizational culture. Suggestions are made for future research in this area as well as directions for future training programs.

Changing U.S. Work Force Demographics

It is more apparent than ever before that the changing demographics of the U.S. work force are increasing the ethnic, cultural, religious, age and socio-economic diversity. Specialists maintain that employers are demanding a more highly-skilled, professional/technical workforce (Montana & Charnov, 1987). However, researchers claim that the skill levels of more demographically diverse workforce are declining and that by the year 2000, 75% of the U.S. employees will have to be retrained in professional and technical areas (Cox & Blake, 1991; Offerman & Gowing, 1990; Thomas, 1990).

While job-skill training and continuous education address the underskilled (Montana & Charnov, 1987; Nelson & O'Day, 1989), work force diversity training will then address the communication needs of the existing and ever increasing diversity within U.S. organizations. It is understood that in order to compete with other U.S. and global corporations, organizations must address diverse employees' needs and talents in decision-making processes, problem-solving approaches, and in the overall corporate environment through company wide diversity oriented programs (Beer & Watson, 1990; cox & Blake, 1991; Gradenswartz & Rowe, 1992; Sweeney & Nussbaum, 1989).

Many organizations currently address employee and corporate

needs through "diversity management," a philosophy that concerns building systems and corporate cultures that unite different people in a common pursuit without undermining their diversity..."It's taking differences into account while developing a cohesive whole" (R. Roosevelt Thomas, Jr., cited in Gordon, 1992, p. 24). Recognition of cultural differences will ultimately guide corporations toward the development of action plans for managing their diverse staffs (Livingston, 1991). How have researchers addressed corporate awareness of communication among the employees in a diverse workforce? Researchers in the academic and training literature tend to discuss trainers' expressed needs separately from organizational employees' expressed needs. The literature excludes a comparison of those views. This study addresses this void in the academic and training literature. It compares the perceived diversity training needs expressed by three populations: (1) diversity trainers, (2) human resource personnel, and, (3) company managers.

Definitions

Several frequently used terms used throughout this article are defined as follows:

1. Managing Diversity: Throughout the literature, there is little consensus on the definition of "diversity." However, a

theme of "difference" seems to emerge from this literature. A blending of perspectives lends itself to the following definition: "Diversity is a managerial perspective with the goal of valuing and utilizing the potential of all employees regardless of individual differences in race, ethnicity, gender, age, immigrant status, sexual orientation, or disability" (Thomas Jr., 1990; Hayles, 1989).

2. Diversity Training: Seminars or workshops designed to improve teamwork, promote harmony (Thiederman, 1991) improve productivity, and increase intercultural sensitivity among employees in organizations.

3. High-tech company: "High-tech" will be used in this study as an abbreviation for high-technology. High technology refers to companies involved in the production or use of advanced or sophisticated devices, especially in the fields of electronics and computers (Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1992).

4. Trainers: Professional, self-employed trainers who specialize in diversity training for high-tech companies.

5. Human Resource Personnel: A department in which managers 1) place workers into well suited jobs; 2) motivate effective human performance leading to acceptable levels of human productivity (often through training and employee development); and 3) evaluate employee performance (Montana & Chernov, 1987).

6. Managers: People in management working with and through individuals and groups to accomplish organizational

goals. Managerial functions in organizations typically involve planning, organizing, motivating and controlling (Hershey & Blanchard, 1982) to achieve results through other people (Montana & Charnov), 1987).

7. Members of underrepresented cultures: People living in the U.S. who are from a cultural background other than European-American. Communication researchers often refer to people fitting this description as "minorities"; this term chosen for the present study suggests a description of difference without using the majority as the reference point.

Future Directions of U.S. Organizations

Organizational communication and intercultural communication researchers suggest that organizations across the U.S. need to operate in and react to the changing diversity of the work force. The startling changes in demographics led researchers (Brislin, 1993; Harris & Moran, 1991; Montana & Chernov, 1987; Rhinesmith et al., 1989; Schockley-Zalaback, 1988) to advocate a new leadership role for managers in organizations that will encourage cultural sensitivity combined with effective interpersonal communication skills.

In addition to rethinking management roles in organizations, U.S. companies that aim to compete in a global market must address new business strategies adapted to their diverse work

force (Livingston, 1991) which increases company productivity and decreases employee turnover (Braham, 1989; Fernandez, 1991; Rosen & Lovelace, 1991). Loden and Rosener (1991) predict that if employee needs are not valued and addressed, there will be a significant decline in the positive climate of the organization, higher turnover of dissatisfied culturally underrepresented employees, low morale and on-going conflict with culturally diverse employees. Additionally, there will be decreased productivity from managers and their supervisees due to lack of ability to work as an effective decision making group.

"Diversity Training" in Organizations

Recent research primarily addresses three areas of corporate diversity training: 1) essential content addressed in diversity training programs; 2) current status of diversity training programs in U.S. organizations; and 3) current offerings by trainers in diversity training. Brislin (1993) details the effective cross-cultural training program as one which helps trainees to identify cultural differences and prepare them for daily intercultural interactions among members of culturally diverse groups. Following this paradigm, many organizations have implemented or are developing diversity training programs. They view diversity training as "the next logical step" (Braham, 1989, p. 34) from the company's dedication to Affirmative Action. "All

this [diversity training] is dictated by the bottom line...You've got to get maximum productivity out of employees. Discrimination, and not being able to manage a diverse work force, will cost the company a lot of money (Braham, 1989, p. 29)."

On the contrary, some organizations report reluctance to implement diversity training programs. Rosen and Lovelace (1991) conducted a general survey of the changing work force in which they gathered data from more than four hundred Society for Human Resource Management members concerning potential issues about diversity. Findings from their study suggest that despite pressure from locally and nationally competitive programs dealing with work place diversity, top managers in various organizations express reluctance to act upon this perceived need. Many supervisors and employers do not see how diversity training will benefit the company financially. They respond in the following way, "workers who do not stay around long enough [might not] prove a return on the investment (Sweeney & Nussbaum, 1989, p. 128)."

Diversity trainer Elsie Cross further suggests that Caucasian males in particular often resist participation in diversity programs for fear of being fired or being accused of representing the oppressive group (Past Tokenism, 1990). Cross claims that employees who are Caucasian and male, as well as employees of culturally underrepresented groups, need to be

perceived as a valuable resource in the process of managing diversity.

Current Offerings by Diversity Trainers

Individuals who specialize in diversity training issues offer corporations several approaches to training. According to the training and development literature, few trainers agree on one particular approach for conducting diversity sessions, let alone on actual content. Most trainers agree, however, that training must be tailored to the needs of each particular company (Abbott, 1988; Copeland-Griggs, 1988; Fernandez, 1991; Past Tokenism, 1990; Thiederman, 1991).

Organizational Culture and Social Perception

Researchers have suggested that individuals selectively perceive stimuli in their environment based on the beliefs and values that their cultural background, organization and their professional position prescribe. The findings in this section represent literature relating to social perception, mainstream U.S. cultural perceptions and values, organizational culture and social status in organizations.

Harris and Moran (1991) describe an organization as "a collection of human objectives, expectations, and obligations

[which] structures human roles and relationships to attain its ends" (p. 134). Many researchers (Conrad, 1990; Frank & Brownell, 1989; Goldhaber, 1990; Handy, 1985; Harris & Moran, 1979, 1991; Schockley-Zalabak, 1988) discuss the characteristics of an organization as reflected in its organization's culture, that is, the "understanding and practices regarding the nature of people and the entity...about reality and truth, vocational activity, or work. [As] such, organizational culture is manifested in values, attitudes, beliefs, myths, rituals; performance, artifacts, and a myriad of other ways " (Harris & Moran, 1991, p. 132). Further, these organizational values and beliefs greatly affect employee behavior and community relationships (Frank & Brownell, 1989; Harris & Moran, 1991).

Thus, an organization's members manifest the culture of the organization. Employees will ultimately accept or reject the organizational culture. "If it is the former, then the member may conform or modify that culture. If it is the latter, then its personnel become frustrated or leave that organization (Harris & Moran, 1991, p. 134)."

Grounded in the theory of social perception, social status within an organization, plus the influence of organizational culture, these researchers asked the following questions:

1. What are the diversity training needs reported by high-tech human resource personnel?
2. What are the diversity training needs reported by high-

tech managers?

3. What are the high-tech diversity training needs reported by independent diversity trainer consultants?

Methods

Twelve individuals from the Pacific Northwest United States comprised this study sample. Eight respondents are high-tech employees (three human resource personnel and five company managers) and four respondents are independent diversity trainers. The participants included four women and eight men, two Asian-Americans, one Nicaraguan-American, one African-American and eight European-Americans. A University Human Subjects Research Review Committee approved this research before any subjects were contacted. Each respondent signed a consent form.

Prior to interviewing the twelve subjects, a pilot study determined which questions would give rise to the richest data. Twenty-four individuals from human resource departments, training & development and upper management of thirteen Northwest U.S. based organizations participated in the pilot study. The participants identified whether a perceived need existed for diversity training in four different markets: high-tech, law, mass media and education.

Based upon the pilot study, questionnaires were designed and subjects contacted in high tech businesses. Open-ended and

closed-ended questions constituted the interview schedule for this study. Two separate guides were developed, each tailored to the three different sub-groups of respondents. Nine open and closed ended questions were developed for the company employee schedule, and eleven for the diversity trainers' interview schedule (see Table 1). These schedules were designed to gather individual interpretive data from the respondents. Secondary questions were formulated either to follow-up on issues to which respondents made previous mention, or to guide the respondents in answering particular issues more specifically. Thus, the interview schedule provided an instrument adaptable to each subject's responses.

Insert Table 1 about here

The interviews were conducted Winter, 1993. The length of each interview ranged from 40-90 minutes; thirteen interview hours were completed. One researcher conducted each individual interview. Time and location of the interviews were scheduled at the interviewees' convenience. The researcher conducted interviews on site at the organizations in which respondents were employed, either in cafeterias, board rooms, or in personal offices. Due to the nature of the open-air layout of many high-tech companies, most of the interviews proceeded with minor interruptions either from co-workers or from the general high

noise level. A few of the interviews with the trainers, however, took place in the interviewees' homes; these interviews had fewer interruptions despite client telephone calls. The interviewer, with permission of the respondents, tape recorded interviews. Should the tape recording malfunction, the interviewer also took written notes during the interviews.

The interviewer transcribed all twelve interviews within forty eight hours following the interview. The interviewer transcribed a total of seventy hours of interview tape. The interviewer assigned a number to each cassette tape and transcription for research records and analysis purposes. The interviewer reviewed each interview tape one time through before transcribing word for word. Finally, the interviewer compared the audio tape to the written transcription to ensure reliability of transcribing.

Upon completion of the face-to-face interviews, the interviewer analyzed the responses given to each question using an "analytic inductive" approach. The interviewer listened to the tapes and marked the transcriptions to identify thematic categories.

Results

Four major clusters emerged from company employees responses: 1) company employee perceptions of the meaning of diversity; 2) perceived diversity training needs for their respective companies; 3) current company communication training

programs; and 4) suggested designs for diversity training programs. Also, five major clusters emerged from trainers' responses: 1) perceptions of the meaning of diversity; 2) general and specific high-tech diversity training needs; 3) beliefs about diversity training; 4) reported diversity training programs they have offered their clients; and 5) reported outcomes of diversity training programs.

The two clusters that were similar across the respondents were 1) Perceptions of the Meaning of Diversity, and 2) Diversity Training Needs. From an employee perspective, human resource personnel and company managers perceived the meaning of diversity as "differences between people," and "differences." They contrasted diversity as a "business necessity" with legal measures, especially Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity. Employees also referred to diversity with respect to company values as "the [company] culture: this is your identity." Finally, employees described diversity in relation to their personal experiences with feeling "different" and "what it means to be a minority."

Both HR personnel and company managers thought other employees throughout the company would provide a definition for diversity similar to their own. They suggested, however, that some other employees might have "trouble defining it."

Diversity trainers also described diversity as "differences" and "differentiated groups." They contrasted diversity as a

process of accepting, respecting, understanding and welcoming people of diverse backgrounds to "something that provides answers."

When describing their perceptions of other diversity trainers' views of diversity, these trainers suggested many might talk about "isms" while they thought other trainers might take "mainly legal approaches." Trainers described HR personnel as also likely to describe diversity as "legal issues," as being "the same," and as "productivity."

Table 2 illustrates and summarizes the various perceptions of the meaning of diversity from both company employee (human resource personnel and company manager) and diversity trainer perspectives.

Insert Table 2 About Here

Table 3 depicts each of the above categories by human resource, company manager and diversity trainer response. Roman numerals from Table 2 indicate the response sets in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 About Here

Trainers identified three factors associated with general diversity training needs: 1) "our demographics are changing;" 2) "the fear has to be eliminated in white male workers;" and 3) "we need to make an end to oppression" by getting rid of "the assimilationist policy" and by "be[ing] proactive...and creat[ing] a positive force."

Trainers also identified four specific high-tech industry needs: 1) "understand differences in work style," "clearer understanding of how to make groups function"; b) "human relations training"; c) "how to avoid the feeling of tokenism"; and d) "training...in English." They thought, however, that high-tech companies would expect a "total fix-it kit" training program either because 1) they perceive diversity training as "an interruption to their real job," or 2) "they've been mandated by higher authorities and by government to do this."

Table 4 identifies the company employees and trainers perceived diversity training needs.

Insert Table 4 About Here

Table 5 identifies a breakdown of the categories from Table 4 by human resource personnel, company manager and diversity trainer response. Roman numerals in Table 5 indicate the response sets in Table 4.

Each of the remaining emergent categories were unique to

each sub-group of the sample. Human resource personnel and company managers reported that company communication training programs are "good for an awareness [but] we're just scratching the surface" and are "working to a limited extent."

The comments most frequently heard from trainers regarding the successes of current corporate diversity training programs centered around the relationship between training today and bottom line effects. A sampling of the subjects' statements are: "...connect[ing] diversity with business success," and selling the company on "what...you're getting back for your money," and "why it makes sense [financially] for the company."

Each company employee interviewed suggested primary needs as defining of "diversity training" and "pilot studies." They reported that definitions and pilot studies will be considered "legal back up steps" before implementing across the board employee trainings. The titles for the trainings sessions were most frequently referred to as "international training," "interracial training," "diversity training," and "intercultural training."

Grounded in their personal beliefs and perceptions of how to implement diversity training, trainers spoke of conflict between themselves and their clients' personal value systems. Trainers also emphasized program success and total employee involvement: Success is "contingent upon the commitment from top managements;" "Everybody has to be trained;" "The company has to utilize its

entire work force."

The trainers emphasized that the trainings usually are designed for the management level and different learning styles. Activities are grounded in perception, conflict, case studies, critical incidents, and personal experiences. Each trainer reported that during some stage in the training, they incorporate issues of self-awareness and experiences with diversity. Every trainer reported a follow-up component to their diversity programs by "setting it up in the contract." While types of follow-up vary, it is necessary to "act as a reinforcement for training," further, programs excluding follow-up work are of "limited utility" and are "superficial at best...but it is better than nothing." Trainers reported that as a result of completing workshops, participants would be able to: "appreciate stylistic differences," "have a much higher level of understanding of each other," "give people respect," "establish organizational norms," and "institutionalize...policies, procedure and values," develop teams faster," "talk about differences more willingly," and "be more concerned about...discrimination complaints."

Discussion

Overall, company employees had a more difficult time defining "diversity" and "diversity training" than the trainers. Though employees gave lengthy and inciteful answers, there was

not a common thread in their definitions. Trainers elaborated more easily on the concept of "diversity" and "diversity trainers" than did the employees. However, even among the trainers they exhibited some hesitation about confidence in their own definitions of "diversity" and implementation of "diversity trainings." Organizational communication and training and development literature confirm the lack of agreement about how to define diversity. While there is not a consistent definition of diversity in the literature, researchers and the interview data in this study confirm the importance of defining diversity according to company policies before developing and designing diversity training programs (Copeland, 1988). There needs to be a common understanding of how to define diversity in order to heighten employee awareness of its existence and legitimize its importance.

Employees interviewed in this research reported that fellow employees would have as much, if not more difficulty defining diversity than they. These employees seemed to perceive similarity with their co-workers as most likely due to the similarity in the practices, values and norms that are encouraged and reinforced in their respective organizations. This is consistent with the notion that the culture of the organizations in which these employees work greatly influences their world views and the meanings they assign to concepts, e.g., "diversity."

The respondents' difficulty defining diversity, as well as their perceptions of others' tendencies to have similar difficulties, suggests a general lack of exposure to and understanding of existing diversity issues in these high tech organizations. Data point to the need for more awareness of such issues; this need could be addressed through education of existing and projected future diversity issues, as well as training of the skills necessary to be able to talk about such issues.

The overriding theme articulated by all twelve participants was "diversity as difference." Company employees and diversity trainers address two primary issues: 1) diversity as differences across groups of people, and 2) diversity as managing differences to maximize productivity. They identified these groups as differences defined by gender, culture, ethnicity, sexual orientation and disability. However, a specific variance emerged in their responses. The employees focused on what accounts for these differences. For example, one respondent said,

> Diversity means differences. It means variety. It means, in the general use of the word, like when I think of diverse topics or whatever. It's a wide variety, a wide set encompassing a lot of different topics or whatever. If you're talking specifically culturally or whatever, it still would apply.

Trainers, on the other hand, abstracted other levels of

meaning from these differences. They listed not only demographic differences, but also emphasized inclusive definitions which encompass and value differences. For example, one trainer said, "[Diversity is] the heartbeat of bringing all people...from different groups...to the table to be included..."

Employees and trainers commented on the high tech organizational culture as focusing on performance and production rather than demographic differences. Thus, difference in style may be tolerated if it is perceived as adding to productivity or department output. Difference that is not "bottom-line" related is overlooked, not recognized or denigrated. Within this framework, human resource personnel and managers discussed the need for diversity training to address "neglected employee group needs."

Employees responses often associated diversity training with the Affirmative Action or Equal Employment Opportunity Office. Trainers discussed diversity training as the process that addresses the difference in the workplace as opposed to the legal action (EEO) or the plan (Affirmative Action). Employees alluded to "assimilation" of their colleagues into the high tech culture while trainers seemed to emphasize "acculturation" of differences within the teams in the high tech organizations. Lieberman's (1994) notion of the differences between "assumed assimilation" and "attempting acculturation" is aligned with the employees' comments about focusing on the differences that "fit into the

high tech culture," and the trainers' reported emphasis on "encouraging recognition of employees' differences to improve productivity and enhance the high tech culture." Walker (1986) relates valuing diversity to employee motivation in the work place: "in an environment where people feel they are valued and that their differences add value, they are motivated to give their very best" (p. 1). Further, Fernandez (1991) suggests that those companies who do not facilitate a supportive environment for culturally underrepresented employees will lose those employees to other companies who promote a supportive climate.

Trainers emphasized the "fix-it" approach that their high tech clients usually want. They claim that diversity training is perceived as an interruption to productivity and the business schedule. Researchers claim that high tech "ready, aim, fire philosophy...and fast turnaround" (Kelley, 1985, p. 54), supports the reasoning behind the just-in-time, quick, fix-it approach. This is contrary to trainers' perceptions of diversity as a long-term process that involves total company commitment. For organizational satisfaction and trainer credibility, these varying approaches to purposes and goals of training need to be aligned. Each trainer emphasized that corporations need to develop more extensive cultural diversity programs that influence the overall organizational culture.

Suggestions for Diversity Training Development and Content

The high tech employees expressed the need to tailor diversity training program content not according to trainers' needs, but instead to identified company employee needs. Many respondents within this sample reported that employees' needs are not being met; members of underrepresented culture groups often feel marginalized or feel they are treated differently from the mainstream culture groups. This indicates that some high tech company employees may lack a general understanding of cultural and other diversity issues which may translate into a lack of sensitivity to diverse employees' needs. Thus, suggested training issues to be included in future diversity training programs for these companies are: cultural self-awareness, culturally sensitive skills to increase communication and involvement among employees of diverse backgrounds.

Employee and trainer differences in approach to training should be taken into consideration. Employees focused on process of training programs. For example, employees discussed how their companies should develop the programs once legal policies are established and upper management support institutionalization of such programs. Trainers focused on content of the programs. Indepth responses focused on the cognitive, affection and behavioral dimensions of the theory presented and activities

introduced, incidents and case studies and defining terminology, conflict inventories, and small group experiences. Both approaches need to be understood and incorporated into the training proposal.

In order to create the most effective diversity programs, it seems imperative that corporations understand why it is that they select certain content areas for training and that the trainer work with the organization through an organizational assessment and pre-training interviews (collecting quantitative and qualitative data) assessing the diversity training needs within each corporation.

Future Research

While the conclusions drawn from the data gathered emerged from the four high tech organizations and four diversity trainers represented in this sample, they are not necessarily generalizable outside this sample. A study gathering data from a wider and more inclusive sample other than Pacific Northwest high tech companies needs further exploration. Ensuing studies could ascertain whether the emergent patterns and issues thematized in this study are similar in other high tech organizations. Also, a replication would encourage more suggestions for global high tech businesses. Finally, findings from further studies comparing perceptions of other employees (e.g., top executives, line staff) could provide diversity trainers and high tech corporations with more complete information about employee needs and diversity

trainer assessments of their clients' needs.

The aim of this research was to explore self-report data from a select group of Pacific Northwest high tech employees and self-employed Pacific Northwest diversity trainers about their perceptions of diversity and diversity training needs; however, a quantitative approach to diversity training in organizations would allow for a greater number of individuals to be interviewed addressing identifiable factors and dimensions. This information could provide businesses with numerical information about other existing diversity training programs in their respective industries, and also help diversity trainers better meet the needs of their clients by providing statistics on perceived needs for different employee groups in different industries.

References

ABBOTT, J. (1988). *The multicultural workforce: New challenges for trainers.* American Society for Training and Development, 12-13.

BEER, M., & WATSON, E. (1990). Developing the competitive organization: Interventions and strategies. *American Psychologist, 45(2),* 154-161.

BRISLIN, R. (1993). *Understanding culture's influence on behavior.* Orlando, Fl: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers.

BRAHAM, J. (1989, February). No, you don't manage everyone the same. *Industry Week,* 29-35.

CONRAD, C. (1990). *Strategic organizational communication.* Orlando, FL: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

COPELAND, L. (1988a, May). Learning to manage a multicultural workforce. *Training,* 48-56.

COPELAND, L. (1988b, July). Pioneers and champions of change, *Personnel,* 44-49.

COPELAND-GRIGGS (1988). *Developing training goals and objectives.* In Copeland-Griggs Productions packet for Valuing Diversity Training.

COX, T.H. & BLAKE, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Executive, 5(3),* 45-56.

FERNANDEZ, J.P. (1991). *Managing a diverse workforce: Regaining*

the competitive edge. Lexington, MA: D.C. Health and Co.

FRANK, A.D., & Brownell, J.L. (1989). *Organizational communication and behavior*. Orlando, FL: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

GARDENSWARTZ, L. & Rowe, A. (1992). Does your organization welcome diversity? A publication of *Managing Diversity* Jamestown Area Labor Management Committee.

GOLDHABER, G.M. (1990). *Organizational communication* (5th ed.). Dubuque, IO: Wm.C. Brown Publishers.

GORDON, J. (1992, January). Rethinking Diversity. *Training*, 23-30.

HANDY, C.B. (1985). *Understanding organizations*. New York, NY: Viking Penguin, Inc.

HARRIS, P.R., & Moran, R.T. 91991). *Managing cultural differences* (3rd ed.). Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company.

KELLY, J.W. (1985). Storytelling in hi-tech organizations: A medium for sharing culture. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 13, 45-58.

LIEBERMAN, D.A. (1994). *Implementing company wide diversity training: Assumed similarity and attempted acculturation.* (Unpublished Manuscript). Portland State University, Department of Speech Communication, Portland, OR.

LVINGSTON, A. (1991, January). What your department can do. *Working Woman*, 59-60.

MONTANA, P., & CHARNOV, B.H. (1987). *Management*. Hauppauge, NY:

Barron's Educational Series, Inc.

NELSON, D., & O'DAY, P. (1989). *Workplace 2000.* Chicago,IL: Human Resources Publications, Inc.

Past Tokenism (1990, May). *Newsweek*, pp. 37-43.

RHINESMITH, S.H., WILLIAMSON, J.N., EHLEN, D.M., & MAXWELL, D.S. (1939, April). Developing leaders for the global enterprise. *Training & Development Journal*, 26-34.

ROSEN, B., & LOVELACE, K. (1991, June). Piecing together the diversity puzzle. *Human Resource Magazine*, 78-84.

SCHOCKLEY-ZALABAK, P. (1988). *Fundamentals of organizational communication.* White Plains, NY: Longman, Inc.

SWEENEY, J.J., & Nussbaum, K. (1989). *Solutions for the new work force.* Cabin John, MD: Seven Locks Press.

THIEDERMAN, S. (1991). *Bridging cultural barriers for corporate success.* Lexington,MA: D.C. Health and Co.

WALKER, B.A. (1986). Leading core groups: Leading dialogue about race, sex, and all kinds of differences. In Armour and R. Hayles' Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication, *Managing Multicultural Organizations.*

Table 1

Human Resource Personnel and Company Manager Interview Guide

1. Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. Please explain in your own words what "diversity" means to you.

2. How do you think other people in your department might describe the meaning of "diversity"? How might other employees in your company describe it?

3. What are some of the different ways that diversity training is offered in your company? How often does the training take place? How long is each session?

4. What are some of the different ways that diversity training is offered in your company? How often does the training take place? How long is each session?

5. What are some of the different ways that diversity training is offered in your company? How often does the training take place? How long is each session?

6. What have you observed about the outcome of diversity training here? What do you think the outcome really is?

7. Have you participated in any diversity training sessions? If so, when? Have you noticed any subsequent changes based in that/those experiences in terms of a? how you talk about diversity or cultural differences; b) how you interact with co-workers/supervisees of different cultures? If not, who do you think this is?

8. In thinking about our discussion, is there anything else you would like to add?

9. IF I think of any other questions, after I leave here today concerning some issues we discussed, may I contact you?

Table 1 continued

Trainer Interview Guide

1. Thank you for participating in my study. In your own words, please explain what "diversity" means to you.

2. How do you think other trainers would describe "diversity"? How do you think 1) human resource personnel might describe "diversity"? b) company managers might describe "diversity"?

3. Could you please describe what a typical diversity training session would be for your high tech clients (e.g., activities, length of sessions, etc.)?

4. Why do you think diversity training is important?

5. What do you think high tech organizations need in diversity training?

6. Do you think that high tech companies perceive diversity training issues as important? If so, what do you think, from a high tech companies' point of view, they are looking for in diversity training? If not, what do you think contributes to it not being so important to them?

7. As a result of your diversity training sessions, what do you want your high tech clients to be able to do? Do you think they achieve that outcome? Why?

8. After diversity trainings, do you do follow-up work with your high tech clients? If yes, please describe what you do. If not, why not?

9. In your experience as a diversity trainer, have you noticed any changes in your high tech clients in terms of a) how they think about diversity/cultural differences; b) how they interact with their co-workers from different cultures? If so, what kinds of changes? If not, why do you think this is?

10. In thinking about our discussion, is there anything else that you would like to add?

11. If I think of any other questions after I leave here today concerning some of the issues we have discussed, may I contact you?

Table 2

Perceptions of the Meaning of Diversity

	Perceptions of Meaning
I.	Diversity as Different Groups
	a. differences
	b. different groups of people
II.	Diversity as Organizational Values
III.	Diversity as Personal Experience
	a. childhood upbringing
	b. personal feelings of being different
IV.	Diversity as a Business Issue vs. Legal Measures
V.	Diversity as a Process of Valuing vs. a Product

Table 3

Perceptions of the Meaning of Diversity by Human Resource Personnel, Company Managers and Trainer Responses

Type	Perception of Meaning				
Human Resources		II	IIIa,b	IV	
Company Managers	I	II	IIIb	IV	
Trainers	I			IV	V

Table 4

Diversity Training Needs

	Needs
I.	General Diversity Training Needs
	a. due to the changing work force
	b. to eliminate fear in white male workers
	c. to eliminate oppression of members of underrepresented groups
	d. increased team work both internationally and domestically
	e. increased awareness and consciousness about existing diversity issues
	f. valuing the diverse work force
II.	Diversity Training Needs Contextualized with Broader, Societal Changes
III.	Training Needs for High Tech Organizations
	a. understand differences in work/group styles
	b. human relations training
	c. how to avoid the feeling of tokenism
	d. training in English
IV.	Perceived High Tech Company Expectations of Diversity Training Programs
	a. credible diversity trainers
	b. immediate results
V.	Training Needs for Successful Companies of the Future
	a. commitment from top management
	b. total diversity training for all employees
	c. utilization of the diverse work force
	d. tailored to employee needs
	1. design of program
	2. address perceived neglected employee group needs

Table 5

Response Sets to Human Resource Personnel, Company Manager and Diversity Trainer Responses

Type	Diversity Training Needs			
Human Resource	If	II		Va,d
Company Managers	Id,e	II		Va,d
Trainers	Ia,b,c	III	IV	Va,b,c